



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

among those works to be recommended for classes in elementary Italian.

L. EMIL MENDER.

Johns Hopkins University.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

Hartmann von Aue. Iwein der Ritter mit dem Löwen. Herausgegeben von EMIL HENRICI. ('Germanistische Handbibliothek,' viii, viii 2.) Erster Teil: Text. Zweiter Teil: Anmerkungen. Halle: 1891-1893. 8vo, pp. xxxix, 526.

HARTMANN'S 'Iwein,' traditionally the M.H.G. classic, has naturally long formed the main centre of the study of the Court-Epic. Lachmann's editions, Benecke's 'Wörterbuch,' and many separate essays and studies, have provided a very complete critical apparatus, more complete than that of any other M.H.G. monument, with the exception, possibly, of Walther von der Vogelweide and the 'Nibelungenlied.' Henrici's new edition, now complete, increases this material considerably, and to a still greater degree facilitates its use. While it cannot be considered final—the time for that has not yet come—it marks a great step in advance, and will give a new impulse to the study of 'Iwein.'

As especial features of the book may be enumerated: 1. Scrupulously detailed marginal references to the corresponding lines of Chrestien (ed. Foerster). 2. Variations from L¹ and L² cited below the text. 3. MS. readings, complete to all intents and purposes, placed where they belong, at the bottom of the page. 4. Parallel passages from other M.H.G. works, below the annotations in the second part, showing equally good judgment. 5. 'Namenverzeichnis,' giving MS. variants.

The text is constituted quite independently of Lachmann. The latter's metrical canons are entirely disregarded in so far as text-emendation is concerned. The editor defines his position in the following words:

"Von einer wechselbeziehung zwischen wortform und metrik, einer gestaltung der sprachform nach dem von der metrik gewonnenen bilde (Roediger, S. 82) erwarte ich nichts" (p. xxxvi, footnote).

For the present time this is, from a practical

point of view, doubtlessly correct, but still it seems questionable whether it can be stated in such a general way. In fact, as a matter of principle it hardly seems tenable in just this form. Scientists do this same thing every day. So when we obtain rules of phonetic change from word-equations, and refuse to recognize kinship where these rules are apparently not observed—no matter how closely related the meaning—, the principle is the same as that rejected by Henrici. Fairly stated, it is merely a question of numbers. If there are ten cases of strict observance over against one of apparent non-observance, we may possibly refuse to accept the latter as evidence against our rule, and conclude that the two words are not akin. In principle the two methods are the same. It is true, however, that in results the other procedure, text-emendation from metrical canons, is by far the more dangerous: it interferes with the material, obscures evidence, often for years to come. Hence the tenacity with which Lachmann's theories have for decades clung to the science. In comparative grammar, to follow up the analogy, there is no such danger: judgments may be corrected, without prejudice, at any time: a starred form carries its own danger signal. Hence the value of conservatism in textual criticism in general. And in justice to Henrici it should be said that he has been as chary of admitting his own suggestions and aperçus into the text, as he has been sceptical towards Lachmann's restorations.

Pp. xvi-xxix of the Introduction contain an investigation into the MS. relationship, the vexed question treated by Paul in vol. i of the *Beiträge*, and, more recently, by Böhme, *Germania*, xxxv. Henrici's conclusions are:

"dass von den einzelverhältnissen, welche Paul und Böhme bemerkt haben, manche festzuhalten sind; die stammbäume haben sich dagegen nicht bewährt."

Not having succeeded in constructing a new "stammbaum" himself, he concludes (p. xxxii):

"... ebenso berechtigt ist der gedanke, dass hier eine andere redaction von des dichters eigener hand zu tage trete und dass es mehrere echte Iweine gab. Mit dieser vermuthung würden sich sämtliche widersprüche . . . ohne mühe lösen lassen: die untersuch-

ung würde bei dieser sache überhaupt nicht geführt werden können."

Many of Benecke's and Lachmann's notes have found, enclosed in quotation marks, a place in Henrici's notes. Many more, however, have been omitted, so that the commentary to the Lachmann edition still has independent value. Lachmann's and Benecke's property should, consistently, have been distinguished by an added B. or L. As it is, one is often in doubt as to the origin of a note.

Incorporated in the body of the notes are some hundred errata to the text, the Lachmann variations, and the MS. readings. Many of these are unimportant, but, if important enough to correct, they should have been collected in tabular form as errata. The student now has to gather them from among hundreds of explanatory notes.

These notes cover pp. 389-518. They exhibit to a marked degree soundness of critical judgment combined with acuteness of observation. It is evident, however, that the editor feels the restraint of the task as set him ("auf Zachers ausdrücklichen wunsch"), to incorporate into the text unchanged Benecke's and Lachmann's explanatory notes. The latter's "metrica" are enclosed in brackets.

A few remarks as to matters of detail in the 'Anmerkungen' may follow: l. 194 *nieman: dan* is not "*vereinzelt*." Add for Iwein, l. 2825 (*gewan: ieman*), 3227 (*dan: nieman*), 5889 (*kan: nieman*).—l. 308. Add Erec 1982, 8228, 8938, 9878.—l. 2037. Add Erec 7383 (*von stine gewalte*), Greg. 2873, (2701) (*ze gewalte*), Iw. 5636 (*mit gewalte*).—l. 2668. Erec 1780 has *enlaste* (MS. and Haupt). It is misleading to print it any other way, especially when Henrici states further on that he has, for the Iwein, followed the usage of the MSS. as to the manner of representing these inaccurate rimes. For *mahte*, etc., cf. Haupt on Erec 419, where several additional instances are given. To these (as well as to those of Naumann, *Zfda.* xxii, 34) there are, furthermore, to be added Erec 2973 and 3443. Rimes like *gesat: stat* occur, says Henrici, twenty times (twenty-one times as a matter of fact) "in den übrigen werken," and ". . . die verwendung solcher dialektreime für die chronologie der gedichte Hartmanns . . . wird dadurch hinfällig." But

how are these twenty-one other cases distributed? Erec has sixteen, the first 'Büchlein' one, Gregorius four, certainly a most remarkable fact if it be not due to chronological causes. The truth is that discrimination is necessary in judging these "dialektreime"; each category should be treated separately. Compare with this the editor's own note on *hâte*, l. 31. The reference "vgl. zu 483" in the note to l. 2668 I do not understand.—l. 3365. A curious line of division is here drawn between the adjective *nâ* and the adverb *nâhen*:

"L's bemerkung, dass Hartm. 6878 *nâ* als adjectiv im reime brauche, ist kein beweis, dass das adverb hier ebenso lauten könne: dies heisst im reim nur *nâhen*."

But Iw. 6878 has "wan in was diu kampfzît alsô *nâ*," which is certainly as much adverb as *nâhen* in Iw. 3365 "*dâ er lac . . . nâhen ze guoter mâze bi der lantstrâze*." The only difference is that in the one case it is temporal, in the other local. So in Gregorius 294 (124) *ir bette stuonden sô nâ*, we certainly have the adverb. The treatment in Benecke's 'Wörterbuch' is a very confused one, but *nâ* in Iw. 6878 is at least correctly given as an adverb, though classed under an entirely wrong category (p. 181).—ll. 6238, 40, 42. To *lich* add Iw. 179; to *lichen* add Iw. 2480; to *lichen* Iw. 48; "*nie gelich*," says Henrici, which is true enough, but sounds rather strange when taken in connection with the fact that Henrici himself writes these doubtful forms with *î*.—l. 7035. Add Erec 6743, 7848; Greg. 362 (192).—l. 7106. Add Erec 2564 for *kreijiieren*.—l. 7182. The note is apt to be misleading, since neither the dative *deheiner* nor *ergân* are in L's text.

I have noted the following slight misprints: l. 4098, Ms. readings, number given twice.—l. 5661. Read *höchwart*.—l. 6300. Read *bôt*.—Note on l. 583. Read "vgl. zu 2668" instead of 2666.—Note on l. 1006. Read A. H. 1137 instead of 1139.—Note on l. 3622. Read *B* 3621 instead of 3521.—Note on l. 3840. Read *lenn* instead of *keun*.—Note on l. 5022. Read "Erec 5389," instead of 5387 (so L., but Henrici corrects similar errors elsewhere).—Note on l. 5610. Read "Greg. 2851" instead of 2850.

The 'Namenverzeichnis' concludes the

volume. Although Benecke's 'Dictionary to Iwein' includes proper names, this list has a value of its own from the MS. variants cited for each passage, the equivalents in Chrestien being also quoted at the end of each heading. The plan, if carried out for the body of the Iwein text, would make an important addition to the material for the study of M.H.G. The attempt might very well be made for a third edition of Benecke's 'Wörterbuch,' the references being at the same time made to refer to lines instead of sections.

In conclusion, it may be repeated that Henrici's work forms one of best-edited M.H.G. texts. The labor bestowed on it must have been enormous, and deserves generous acknowledgment. Combined with accurate scholarship, the author has shown a thorough appreciation of practical convenience, with an entire disregard for additional labor entailed. With this new edition of Hartmann's work, with Benecke's 'Wörterbuch zu Iwein' and Foerster's edition of the French Yvain, we have a nearly complete apparatus. Nearly complete only, because there are still wanting dictionaries to Hartmann's other works, and rime indices to all. The former were once contemplated by Hornig ('Formen und Gebrauch des Satzartikels . . . bei Hartmann von Aue,' Brandenburg a.H., 1847) and the work ought still to be undertaken, even if on a less extensive scale than that on which Hornig started. That the latter should exist for Wolfram and not for Hartmann is an anomaly. The reviewer hopes to be able to supply this deficiency shortly.

B. J. Vos.

Johns Hopkins University.

CORRESPONDENCE.

'TO TAKE TIME BY THE FORELOCK.'

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—Readers of the discussion of 'To Take Time by the Forelock' in the December number of MOD. LANG. NOTES must have wondered not a little at the omission of one very obvious reference,—'Faerie Queene,' ii, 4, 4 ff. Here Occasion is thus described:

"And him behynd a wicked hag did stalke,
In ragged robes and filthy disaray;
Her other leg was lame, that she noite walke,
But on a staffe her feeble steps did stay:
Her lockes, that loathly were and hoarie gray,
Grew all afore, and loosly hong unroid;
But all behinde was bald, and worne away,
That none thereof could ever taken hold;
And eke her face ill-favourd, full of wrinkles old."

Guyon seizes her by the forelocks:

"Therewith Sir Guyon left his first emprise,
And, turning to that woman, fast her bent
By the hoare lockes that hong before her eyes."
(St. 12.)

I add two other passages that may be of interest:

"Francesco . . . tooke opportunitie by the forehead.—" Greene, 'Francesco's Fortunes,' Works, ed. Grosart, viii, 90.

"Now that the occasion is offered, lay hold of the fore-locks; for if once shee turne her backe, make sure accompt never after to see her face againe."

"The Observations of Sir Francis Hawkins Knight in his Voiage into the South Sea A.D. 1593" (published 1622), in The 'Hawkins' Voyages,' ed. Markham, Hakluyt Society, p. 298.

May I take this occasion *fronte capillata* to remark that for the misprints in the Greek passage quoted in my article on this subject (MOD. LANG. NOTES, viii, 461) I am guiltless? They are due to the printer's neglect or inability to follow the corrections made in two proofs.

G. L. KITTREDGE.

Harvard University.

THE PHONETIC SECTION.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—The fifth circular of the Phonetic Section, issued in November, 1893, has brought in 140 answers, representing six states east of the Mississippi and all the states east of that river, except New Jersey, Georgia, Florida, and Alabama. The replies have been carefully tabulated, and the most important results will probably be published in three separate articles, dealing (1) with the insertion or omission of a stop between a nasal and a spirant, (2) with the pronunciation of words like 'nature,' 'verdure,' 'issue,'